

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application with Claims 1-9 and 16 being withdrawn from consideration, with Claims 10 and 14 as the examined independent claims. Claims 17-22 are newly added. Claims 10, 14 and 15 are amended.

In the Office Action, Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Agrawal et al.* (US 2002/00118656 A1) in view of *Sakakura* (US 2002/0019880)

As indicated above, independent Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Agrawal* in view of *Sakakura*. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that *Agrawal* teaches all the recitations of this claim, except for “(e) the mobile subscriber station transmitting a mobile IP registration request message for an IP address allocated from the first base station during a MAC connection establishment” and “(f) the second base station relaying the mobile IP registration request message to the first base station during the MAC connection establishment”, which is allegedly taught in *Sakakura*. However, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Amended Claim 10 recites a method for a subscriber station to move to a second base station from a first base station and register a mobile IP in a wireless portable Internet system, the method comprising:

- (a) the second base station and the mobile subscriber station performing a handover;
- (b) the mobile subscriber station performing a re-registration with the second base station;
- (c) transmitting a re-registration request message including a flag showing whether to assign an address using a DHCP (Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol) or a mobile IP to the second base station;

- (d) the mobile subscriber station acquiring a CO A (Care Of Address) from an agent advertisement transmitted from the second base station so as to assign an address using the mobile IP when the flag is set to assign an address using the mobile IP;
- (e) the mobile subscriber station transmitting a mobile IP registration request message for an IP address allocated from the first base station during a MAC connection establishment;
- (f) the second base station relaying the mobile IP registration request message to the first base station during the MAC connection establishment; and
- (g) the first base station transmitting a reply message to the mobile IP registration request message to the mobile subscriber station via the second base station.

The Examiner alleges that *Agrawal* discloses original step (c), “transmitting a re-registration request message including a flag set as a mobile IP to the second base station”, step (d), “the mobile subscriber station acquiring a CO A (Care Of Address), in response to an agent advertisement of the second base station” citing, *inter alia*, paragraphs [0041]-[0043] and step (g), “the first base station transmitting a reply message to the mobile IP registration request message to the mobile subscriber station via the second base station”, citing, *inter alia*, paragraphs [0031]-[0035], as recited in Claim 10.

However, upon review of paragraphs [0041]-[0043] of *Agrawal*, it is respectfully submitted that there is no portion of these citations, or any other section of *Agrawal*, which teaches the original steps (c) and (d) of Claim 10. Furthermore, in order to further distinguish Claim 10 from the Examiner’s cited art, Applicants have amended this claim to more clearly recite the steps teaches the steps (c) and (d) of Claim 10, as set forth above. *Agrawal* does not render amended Claim 10 obvious. Accordingly, Applicants believe this allegation by the Examiner is incorrect.

More specifically, *Agrawal* discloses that a mobile station transmits a forward address request to its current serving base station; the serving base station then relays the forward address

request to the appropriate address server; at the address server, the request is processed and the address server assigns an appropriate forward address for the requesting mobile station and transmits the assigned addresses to the serving base station; and the serving base station then relays the assigned forward addresses to the mobile station. That is, *Agrawal* merely discloses conventional IP-layer registration and authentication with an IP network provider, but does not disclose steps (c) and (d), as recited in Claim 10.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the interpretation asserted by the Examiner is not supported by the disclosure of *Agrawal*.

Further, the Examiner alleges that *Agrawal* discloses, “(g) the first base station transmitting a reply message to the mobile IP registration request message to the mobile subscriber station via the second base station” as recited in Claim 10, citing, *inter alia*, paragraphs [0031]-[0035] of *Agrawal*.

However, upon review of paragraphs [0031]-[0035] of *Agrawal*, Applicants believe that there is no portion of these citations, or any other section of *Agrawal*, which teaches these recitations of Claim 10. That is, *Agrawal* merely discloses that a serving base station communicates with all its neighboring base stations to obtain IP addresses for each mobile station currently being served by the serving base station and each neighboring base station, at the request of the serving base station, and provides an IP address for each mobile station currently being served by the serving base station. However, *Agrawal* does not disclose, “(g) the first base station transmitting a reply message to the mobile IP registration request message to the mobile subscriber station via the second base station”, as recited in Claim 10. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this allegation by the Examiner is incorrect.

Furthermore, the Examiner alleges that *Sakakura* discloses step (e), “the mobile subscriber station transmitting a mobile IP registration request message for an IP address allocated from the first

PATENT APPLICATION  
Attorney Docket No.: 1403-19 PCT US (OPP061488)

base station during a MAC connection establishment”, as recited in Claim 10, citing, *inter alia*, paragraphs [0091], [0102]-[0103] and step (f), “the second base station relaying the mobile IP registration request message to the first base station during the MAC connection establishment” as recited in Claim 10, citing, *inter alia*, paragraph [0099].

However, upon review of paragraphs [0091], [0099] and [0102]-[0103] of *Sakakura*, Applicants believe that there is no portion of these citations, or any other section of *Sakakura*, which teaches these recitations of Claim 10. That is, *Sakakura* merely discloses that an IP communication system for a wireless terminal which eliminates extra traffic to be used for data transfer so as to improve communication latency. The IP communication system for a wireless terminal includes a control center, which controls a plurality of wireless terminals by way of a base station for communicating with an internet terminal over the Internet. The control center is provided with a database for storing the MAC addresses of wireless terminals controlled, the operating status of the respective wireless terminals controlled, and the identification of the respective base stations.

However, *Sakakura* does not disclose step (e) and step (f), as recited in the Claim 10. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this allegation by the Examiner is incorrect.

Based at least upon the arguments above, it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 10 is patentable over the combination of *Agrawal* and *Sakakura* as none of these references, either alone or in combination, teaches or renders obvious all the recitations of Claim 10.

While not conceding the patentability of the dependent claims, *per se*, it is respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 11-15 are also patentable at least for being dependent from independent claim 10, respectively.

Claim 17-22 have been added, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons

PATENT APPLICATION  
Attorney Docket No.: 1403-19 PCT US (OPP061488)

discussed above.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant

**THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, LLP**  
290 Broadhollow Road, Suite 210E  
Melville, New York 11747  
Tel: (516) 228-3565  
Fax: (516) 228-8475